DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 487 CS 011 193

AUTHOR Richmond, Mark G.; And Others
TITLE The Role of the Writing/Reading Connection in Reading Instruction in the Jones County, MS School System.
PUB DATE 13 Nov 92
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Knoxville, TN, November 11-13, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Research; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; Reading Research; *Reading Writing Relationship; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Theory Practice Relationship; *Whole Language Approach
IDENTIFIERS Jones County School District MS; Louisiana

ABSTRACT

A study examined the degree to which teachers employ or perceive that they employ writing/reading strategies in their classrooms, and their perceptions regarding the degree to which their school system should support that effort. A pilot sample of 15 practicing teachers was drawn from a demonstration school in southwest Louisiana. Subjects, 71 K-8 teachers from the Jones County School System in Mississippi completed a questionnaire. A random sample of eight teachers was drawn for classroom observation. Two instruments designed to assess teachers' perceptions of their whole language awareness were administered to the pilot group study for validation purposes. Results of both studies indicated that there was an apparent gap between theory and practice relative to the implementation of a writing/reading basis for literacy development. Teachers appeared to regard their practice at a much higher level than is borne out by observation of environment and practice, and teachers tended to view the school system as needing to provide more support for their ventures into whole language methodology. (Four tables of data are included; 20 references, the teacher questionnaire and the classroom observation schedule are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354487

The Role of the Writing/Reading Connection in Reading Instruction In the Jones County, MS School System

A Paper Presented at the

MidSouth Educational Research Association

Knoxville, TN

November 13, 1992

Submitted by

Mark G. Richmond, Ed.D.

Lynn R. Holifield

University of Southern Mississippi

and

Eileen LaCour

Southwestern Louisiana University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark G. Richmond
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RUNNING HEAD: Writing/Reading Connection

CS 011193

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

To promote successful student achievement, it is important for educators to be aware of alternative instructional techniques that allow each child to attain his/her maximal potential. Current research strongly encourages the writing/reading connection for its potential to enhance student literacy. Goodman (1986) points out, "literacy development is a matter of getting the processes together: learning, in the context of reading and writing real language, to use just enough print, language structure, and meaning, and to keep it all in the proper personal and cultural perspective" (p. 43).

While the combination of writing and reading appears to promote literacy development by strengthening critical thinking skills and making learning more relevant to real-life situations, the degree of implementation of this connection by teachers in Jones County Schools remains untested. Similarly, teacher attitudes towards this holistic instructional technique have yet to be examined. It is proposed that through questionnaire analysis and direct observation, the degree of awareness and implementation of writing/reading methodology in the Jones County School District be explored.

RATIONALE

Certain characteristics emerge among students who are considered "good" readers; one great advantage these students often enjoy is the easy connection between writing and reading. Current research embraces the integration of the two disciplines into a meaningful whole. Eckhoff (1983) points out that the writing/reading relationship is a close one, as readers frequently draw on reading knowledge in their writings.

According to May (1990), "Much of the new emphasis on combining the two comes from our knowledge of `earlyreaders'- those who learn to read and write before they even enter school" (p. 253). May (1990) quoted Durkin as stating that "writing and reading should be taught together" (p. 254). Shanahan (1984) concurs that "it's the combination that works, not one or the other" (p. 468). Most educators now advocate teaching writing immediately preceding reading; the rationale is that by reading back their own writings, students can clearly see the importance of written communication. The greatest advantage of integrating the two, however, is greater reading achievement.

Current research strongly advocates the meaningful connection of writing and reading. This combination serves to strengthen language expression, foster reading ability, and provide for shared communication; thus setting an internal purpose for greater student achievement. With all of the evidence supporting a strong connection between writing and reading, it would seem that evidence for its adoption as sound instructional methodology would be visible in local schools in South Mississippi. To investigate the existence of such methodology, observation of classrooms in the Jones County School District were undertaken to determine the degree to which the writing/reading connection is a viable alternative in current instructional practice. Questions arise when considering the acceptance of teachers and of their view of the action of the school system in provision of a writing/reading environment in their classrooms. Specifically, this study addresses the following questions:

1. Do teachers perceive themselves as providing or desiring to provide a quality writing/reading environment?
2. Do teachers perceive the school system as supportive of development of writing/reading environments?
3. Are teachers' practices in the classroom representative of their self-views of their practice with regard to writing/reading ?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Language-experience approaches combine the language arts into holistic instruction with the use of personal story tellings and group experience charts (May, 1990). The importance of the LEA is that it allows students to create stories using their personal language and then read back what was written. The rationale for student generated text is that vocabulary derived from children's own oral language is more meaningful. Allen (1976), in his hallmark definition of language experience as an approach to teaching reading, explained that in his view, a child could think about a given activity; could talk about those thoughts; could express those thoughts in some form other than oral language; and as a developmental process, could determine the rules of written communication through this process.

Journal writing, another vehicle to foster the writing/reading connection, serves a multitude of purposes: it shows students how important communication is, allows for the invented spelling of emerging literacy, and gives students written feed-back from the teacher. Additionally, by employing cooperative learning in the process, these strategies provide excellent opportunities for students to share reading and writing experiences (May, 1990).

Harste (1990), another strong advocate of the writing/reading bond, has much to say about this special connection; the teaching of the two disciplines should not be done to exclusion in the pre/k classrooms; however, "a well-designed program can enhance children's already considerable language skills by providing ample opportunities for them to use reading and writing in their daily activities" (p. 316). He further states that "beginning literacy instruction should provide opportunities to interact with print in all these contexts using a multitude of expressive forms" (p. 318). Anderson and Simons (1988) elaborate on these arguments by stating that "students should be actively engaged in reading `connectedtext' for a substantial amount of time daily...this includes all forms of good writing- such as stories, poems, excerpts from novels, articles, and essays" (p. 18).

An alternative to, or supplementation of, traditional basals is literature-based reading instruction. Aiex (1988) contends that literature usage in the classroom provides examples of good writing, in addition to an excellent quality of reading material (p. 460). As Smith (1988) regularly points out, the purpose of reading is to understand the author's intent. With this in mind, it logically appears that motivation is higher among students reading their own writings; the purpose of communication is set, and motivation is internally driven.

Smith (1988), a prominent psycholinguist, emphasizes that we learn to read by reading. This assertion is very closely related to current perceptions about the process of writing. Froese (1991), states that children "write to learn, rather than learn to write" (p. 104). Such current assertions place the traditional views of

`teaching' reading in question. Price (1990) cited works of Flower & Hayes and Humes to comprise cognitive researchers' view of the writing process: the ultimate goal of writing is for communication in which information is transmitted from an author to an audience. The traditional method of instruction has been isolation of the two disciplines into separate entities, but more current methodologies such as literature-based reading instruction and the `grass-roots movement' called whole language have joined the two together as a meaningful whole (Goodman, 1989). Current research strongly advocates the writing/reading connection for its "potential to contribute in powerful ways to thinking" (Tierney, Sotor, O'Flahaven, and McGinley, 1989, p. 166). Growing discontent with traditional methodology has led educators to begin searching for alternative instructional techniques.

During the late 1970s, the holistic movement began to grow from the earlier research of Piaget and Vygotsky as well as a growing awareness of the psycholinguistic theory of learning (Hawthorne, 1991).
The Whole language philosophy has been referred to by Goodman (1989) as the "coming of age of educational practice, a new era in which practitioners are informed professionals acting on the basis of an integrated and articulated theory that is consistent with the best scientific research" (p. 207-208). Stewart (1987) recommended that "students be provided with multiple opportunities to acquire and use background knowledge and oral language skills and practice the whole acts of reading and writing..." (p. 90). These statements suggest that in classrooms that successfully employs scenarios, activities will be observable that manifest both communicative aspects.

Students in holistically oriented classrooms are immersed in a language-rich environment where print of all forms is available and quality literature books abound (Hayward, 1988; Froese, 1991). Writing/ reading are taught holistically through the use of LEAs, journal writings, story writings, and other instructional techniques that naturally lend themselves to the blending of these twin aspects of linguistic communication. Additionally, during the period of emergent literacy, where children become aware that print has meaning, invented spelling is encouraged. The ultimate goal of language is for communication; by using invented spelling, students are free to write whatever they can say without the restriction of traditional methodology which stresses that students write only what they can spell correctly.

Scheffler (1991) elaborates on this by stating that "A whole language instructional orientation would be reflected in purposeful writing and reading, group- and student-generated stories, the use of real literature, the

encouragement of risk-taking with language, and a focus on the meaningfulness of the context in which these activities occur" (p. 3).

Closely related to whole language is the constructivist view of learning. An offshoot of psycholinguistics and schema theory, constructivism also recognizes the importance of prior knowledge and making meaningful connections for successful student learning. Spivey and King (1989) expound on this by stating that "constructivism portrays readers as making meaning by integrating content from source texts with previously acquired knowledge in a process that involves the operations of selecting, organizing, and connecting" (p. 9). Furthermore, they state that "selecting, organizing, and connecting are also apparent in discourse synthesis, a highly constructive act in which readers become writers" (p. 9). From this position one must infer that the construction process involves an amalgamation of writing and reading.

Froese (1991) concurs that students should be actively engaged in "real writing" activities, which he defines as "writing that achieves a language function, whether it is to help the writer to understand more clearly his or her own thoughts, feelings, and experiences, to request or record information, or to communicate his or her ideas to other audiences" (p. 100). He further argues that in their dedication to make meaning explicit for an intended audience, students reach the point of becoming `real' writers. A key component of this writing process is ownership or authorship. Students write personal language, read what was written, edit, and revise the work for the goal of maximum communication to be achieved. Writings are often revised with the assistance of peers and teachers through the use of cooperative learning and writers workshops. This process allows students an opportunity to interact with others on drafting and reviewing writings to assure optimal clarity in communication.

In a study conducted on holistic writing/reading, Tierney, et al. (1989) concluded that "writing appeared to serve as a mode through which the learner allowed ideas to come to fruition and resolved disputes. Reading served as a resource for opposing views or for further elaborations upon an idea" (p. 166). This points definitively to the kinds of techniques observable in a whole language/ reading/ writing classroom. Studies such as this clearly show the rationale behind a writing/reading connection.

Among the instructional characteristics suggested in the reviewed literature which should be commonly found in a whole language classroom are:

1. Immersion in language-rich environment
2. Presence of quality literature books

3. Child centered learning[1]
4. Peer collaboration[1]
5. Open communication
6. Comfortable, risk-free atmosphere
7. Student ownership of work
8. Self-selected silent reading
9. Teacher's role of "kid-watcher"[2]
10. Teacher serves as model
11. Dialogue and teacher scaffolding[1]
12. Use of student-generated text
13. Capitalization on oral language skills[4]
14. Language used in context
15. Integration of disciplines
16. Thematic unit instruction
17. Meaningful learning through themes[4]
18. Real writing activities[3] (e.g. journal writing, letters, responses to reading)
19. Acceptance of invented spelling
20. Use of open-ended activities[4]
21. Divergent questions and answers
22. Students actively engaged in reading `connectedtext'
23. Interaction with print through a multitude of expressive forms
24. Clear instances where writing precedes reading and is tied directly to learning experiences in reading.

([1]Hawthorne,1991; [2]Goodman,1986; [3]Froese,1991; [4]Ford & Ohlhausen,1988).

This literature based list of factors involved in writing/reading instructional practice serves as the basis for development of a questionnaire and observation schedule to determine the degree of implementation and accuracy of teacher self-perceptions relative to the topic.

SUBJECTS

Two separate sets of subjects were employed in the subject study. A pilot sample of fifteen practicing teachers was drawn from a demonstration school in southwest Louisiana. This group was engaged to determine that the instruments constructed for this study had adequate validity. The sample to which both experimental instruments were administered was comprised of 71 teachers from the Jones County, MS school system who agreed to participate in the study. These teachers were assigned instructional responsibility in grades k-8, and spent at least part of their school day in reading instruction. After response to the two-sided questionnaire, a random sample of 8 teachers was drawn for classroom observation by the investigators.

INSTRUMENTS

The pilot study employed the two instruments designed specifically for the current study and two additional instruments for correlational purposes. The study proper employed only the two instruments constructed for the study from the reviewed literature. The first constructed instrument (see Appendix A) was designed to collect information in the form of Likert scale responses regarding the degree to which teachers employ or perceive that they employ writing/reading strategies in their classrooms, and their perceptions regarding the degree to which their system should support this effort. The left response column invites teachers to respond vis a vis their practice, while the right response column solicits their responses relative to the system's role in supporting this activity. Twenty-four response stems were isolated from the literature. The second instrument (see Appendix B), a minor modification of the original questionnaire, was designed to allow an observer familiar with the literature on writing/reading elements to determine the degree to which a match between the classroom environment of a given teacher and her perceived writing/reading implementation strategies exists.

The two instruments employed in the pilot study for validation purposes only were the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (DeFord, 1985), and a research instrument designed to assess teachers self-perceptions of their whole language awareness. The TORP is a 28 item checklist designed by Diane DeFord to determine teacher's theoretical orientation towards reading.. The instrument measures teacher's feelings about instructional practices. Teachers are instructed to respond to items which most reflect their feelings on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). The research instrument was a simple

bipolar line upon which teachers were asked to rate their degree of acceptance or rejection of whole language bases.

RESULTS

Results from the pilot study were substantially encouraging, concerning the validation of the two literature-based data collection instruments. Table 1 provides parametric and correlation data for the four instruments used in the pilot study. The primary factor underlying the assumption of validation lies with patterns of correlation with the TORP and the other measures. The TORP is designed to measure teachers' underlying philosophical/theoretical assumptions about reading. All other instruments are designed to allow teachers to express what they believe to be their practices relative to this construct.

Insert Table 1
About here

All correlations with the TORP and the three other instruments were nonsignificant, and approaching 0; indicating that teachers' underlying beliefs about reading and their practices regarding whole language were not related. In other words, teachers in the pilot study were not accurate in gauging their personal knowledge about whole language. Correlations between the instrument designated as 'X' and the experimental instruments were essentially equivalent among the three instruments, though there was a lack of significance between 'X' and the system perception scores. As will be seen, the trends between the pilot sample and the research sample will be consistent.

Results of the primary study are divisible into two sections; results from the questionnaire, and comparison results from the questionnaire and observations. Questionnaire results are displayed in tables 2 and 3. Table 2 displays the statistical outcome for the summed responses for teachers' ratings of their

Insert Table 2
About here

application of writing/reading methodology as compared to their perceptions of the degree to which the system should support those applications. While a highly significant correlation exists between teachers' beliefs about their application of writing/reading methods and their perceptions of the system's role in supporting those applications, a significant difference exists between the summed ratings of those two views.

Based on the summed scores, it appears that teachers rated themselves at a significantly lower level in application of writing/reading methodology than they felt that the system should be supporting. This is taken to mean that teachers wish to be more actively involved in a writing/reading classroom environment, and that they need support from the system to facilitate that effort.

Further confirmation of this finding is to be found upon inspection of Table 3. This table presents the stems from the questionnaire with the frequency counts and mean rating of each stem for both teacher

Insert Table 3
About here

implementation and perceived system need. Of the 12 of 25 significantly different response stems, all showed mean scores that were higher for what the system should be doing than for what teachers perceived themselves as doing in the classroom. Strong evidence exists then, that teachers perceive that they would act in a more holistic manner in their instructional practices with stronger systemic support.

Results from the eight randomly selected teachers whose classrooms were observed strongly support previous findings. T-test of means from teacher and system conform closely with the whole-sample results. When the teacher report means are compared to observed scores, and system need means are compared with observed scores, a new finding is evidenced. Teachers appear to report their writing/reading classroom environment and behavior as being much higher than it is observed as being. Mean differences between teacher reported/observed and system need/observed scores are greater than thirty points in both cases. When interpreted in light of the previous findings of this study, it appears that teachers do not have an

Insert Table 4
About here

accurate perception of their classroom practice vis a vis whole language practices, but by the consistent nature of the misperception, they seem to strongly desire a more holistic literacy development environment. Perhaps there is a paucity of knowledge about whole language theory and practice, but it seems highly unlikely that differences between self-ratings and observed ratings could be so dramatic in the absence of a consistent knowledge base and a desire to implement that base. Certainly, there are some blanks in knowledge of terminology. An example of misunderstood terminology is to be found in response to stem # 12. Given the response to the term 'kidwatcher', the teachers in both the pilot sample and the research sample improperly understood this term to reply to some modification of babysitting. In actuality, the term as used by whole language practitioners refers to student qualitative observation for the purpose of determining individual needs and desires to be incorporated into literacy development.

CONCLUSIONS

There is an apparent gap between theory and practice relative to the implementation of a writing/reading basis for literacy development. Teachers appear to regard their practice at a much higher level than is borne out by observation of environment and practice. Parallel to this finding, teachers tend to view the school system as needing to provide more support for their ventures into whole language methodology. It is conceivable that there is a substantial gap between teachers' knowledge of whole language theory (or philosophy) and their perceptions of that construct in classroom practice.

Further investigations are needed. It appears appropriate that these studies take the form of system evaluations of teacher understanding and implementation of the construct which is whole language. While, admittedly, the instruments constituting the basis of this study were an initial attempt to distinguish teacher perceptions of the various instrumentalities impacting a whole language environment, it seems plausible that more data dealing with specific systemic environments and teachers' expectations about that environment would provide substantial information about the direction of the curricular shift transpiring in literacy development.

Table 1

Pilot results

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teacher	15	102.6000	12.861
System	15	107.2000	5.519
TORP	15	83.4667	6.209
X	15	53.6667	27.220

	Teacher	System	TORP	X
Teacher		.596*	-.165	.522*
System	.596*		.126	.313
TORP	-.165	.126		.133
X	.522*	.313	.133	

* p<.05

Table 2

Teacher Implementation versus Perceived System Support

- T - T E S T - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	* * CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	* *	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
Teacher Does	71	103.6056	9.558						
	(diff)	4.1549	6.826	* .740	.000	*	-5.13	70	.000
System should	71	107.7606	9.365						

Table 3

Questionnaire Response Summary

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please complete the responses on both sides of the questionnaire. On the left side, responses indicate the degree to which you implement the stem in your classroom. On the right side, responses indicate the degree to which you feel your schools system should encourage the implementation of that stem in all classrooms. In either case, responses are as follows: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=no opinion; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree.

As a teacher I								The system should						
--	-	0	+	++	X			--	-	0	+	++	X	
0	1	2	36	33	4.4	□	1. immerse students in a language-rich environment	0	0	3	15	59	4.6	
0	0	1	13	50	4.8		2. provide direct instruction of basic skills	1	0	0	11	60	4.8	
0	2	14	23	33	4.2	□	3. provide quality literature books for students to read.	0	1	2	15	54	4.7	
0	0	4	33	35	4.4		4. encourage child centered learning	0	0	6	26	40	4.5	
0	2	25	16	27	4.0	□	5. require phonics mastery within the primary grades	0	0	10	20	41	4.4	
1	0	7	27	35	4.3		6. allow and encourage peer collaboration	2	0	5	22	41	4.3	
0	0	1	9	60	4.8		7. encourage open communication among students, teachers and parents	0	0	1	10	59	4.8	
3	3	20	19	24	3.8	□	8. agree by committee on selection of Basal Reading materials	1	1	16	18	34	4.2	
0	0	0	16	55	4.7		9. ensure a comfortable, risk-free atmosphere for all students	0	0	1	12	58	4.8	
1	0	12	24	34	4.2		10. promote student ownership of work	1	0	8	23	37	4.3	
1	3	9	32	27	4.1		11. regularly allow self-selected silent reading	0	0	6	21	41	4.3	
25	6	19	6	14	2.6	□	12. view my role as "kid-watcher"	23	5	18	7	18	2.8	
0	1	0	21	50	4.7		13. serve as a model for students to follow	0	1	4	13	54	4.7	
0	1	23	18	27	3.9		14. use dialogue and teacher scaffolding	0	1	21	23	24	3.8	
1	4	30	21	14	3.6	□	15. promote the use of student-generated text	0	2	29	18	22	3.8	
0	0	3	32	36	4.5	□	16. capitalize on oral language skills	0	0	1	21	50	4.7	
0	0	1	29	40	4.5		17. promote language used in context	0	0	2	21	47	4.6	
0	1	12	25	32	4.3	□	18. plan by integration of disciplines	0	0	11	20	39	4.4	
0	1	14	28	27	4.0		19. plan meaningful learning through themes	0	0	12	25	32	4.2	
2	3	9	22	36	4.2	□	20. regularly incorporate real writing activities (e.g. journal writing, letters, responses to reading)	0	0	9	16	46	4.6	
10	12	1	30	19	3.5	□	21. insist upon correct spelling on all work	6	8	8	19	30	3.8	
0	0	16	41	15	4.0		22. regularly use open-ended activities	1	2	14	30	25	4.1	
0	0	15	33	23	4.1		23. prefer divergent questioning and answering	0	1	14	27	29	4.1	
1	3	15	29	23	3.9	□	24. regularly have students engaged in reading 'connected text'	0	0	15	29	27	4.1	
1	0	14	30	26	4.2	□	25. provide interaction with print through a multitude of expressive forms	0	0	12	25	35	4.3	

□ Reflects significant difference ($p<.05$) between means for indicated items

Table 4

T-tests between observed classroom environments and teachers reported method and perceived need for system support.

- T - T E S T - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	* * CORR.	2-TAIL PROB. *	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
Teacher does	8	106.1250	4.155					
	(diff)	-4.2500	5.092	* .391	.339 *	-2.36	7	.050
System should	8	110.3750	4.984					

- T - T E S T - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	* * CORR.	2-TAIL PROB. *	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
Teacher does	8	106.1250	4.155					
	(diff)	30.1250	25.210	* -.136	.749 *	3.38	7	.012
Observation	8	76.0000	24.308					

- T - T E S T - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	* * CORR.	2-TAIL PROB. *	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
System should	8	110.3750	4.984	1.762				
	(diff)	34.3750	22.916	* .374	.362 *	4.24	7	.004
Observation	8	76.0000	24.308	8.594				

Appendix A

Teacher Questionnaire

Grade or Subject _____ **Social Security Number** _____

This information WILL NOT be used to determine individual responses to questionnaires.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please complete the responses on both sides of the questionnaire. On the left side, responses indicate the degree to which you implement the stem in your classroom. On the right side, responses indicate the degree to which you feel your schools system should encourage the implementation of that stem in all classrooms. In either case, responses are as follows: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=no opinion; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree.

As a teacher I		The system should
1 2 3 4 5	1. immerse students in a language-rich environment	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2. provide direct instruction of basic skills	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3. provide quality literature books for students to read.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4. encourage child centered learning	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	5. require phonics mastery within the primary grades	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	6. allow and encourage peer collaboration	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	7. encourage open communication among students, teachers and parents	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	8. agree by committee on selection of Basal Reading materials	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	9. ensure a comfortable, risk-free atmosphere for all students	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	10. promote student ownership of work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	11. regularly allow self-selected silent reading	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	12. view my role as "kid-watcher"	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	13. serve as a model for students to follow	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	14. use dialogue and teacher scaffolding	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	15. promote the use of student-generated text	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	16. capitalize on oral language skills	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	17. promote language used in context	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	18. plan by integration of disciplines	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	19. plan meaningful learning through themes	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	20. regularly incorporate real writing activities (e.g. journal writing, letters, responses to reading)	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	21. insist upon correct spelling on all work	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	22. regularly use open-ended activities	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	23. prefer divergent questioning and answering	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	24. regularly have students engaged in reading 'connected text'	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	25. provide interaction with print through a multitude of expressive forms	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix B

Observation Schedule

Jones County School System
Observation Schedule

1.	Immersion in language-rich environment	A	B	C	D	F
2.	Presence of quality literature books	A	B	C	D	F
3.	Child centered learning	A	B	C	D	F
4.	Peer collaboration	A	B	C	D	F
5.	Open communication	A	B	C	D	F
6.	Comfortable, risk-free atmosphere	A	B	C	D	F
7.	Student ownership of work	A	B	C	D	F
8.	Self-selected silent reading	A	B	C	D	F
9.	Teacher's role of "kid-watcher"	A	B	C	D	F
10.	Teacher serves as model	A	B	C	D	F
11.	Dialogue and teacher scaffolding	A	B	C	D	F
12.	Use of student-generated text	A	B	C	D	F
13.	Capitalization on oral language skills	A	B	C	D	F
14.	Language used in context	A	B	C	D	F
15.	Integration of disciplines	A	B	C	D	F
16.	Thematic unit instruction	A	B	C	D	F
17.	Meaningful learning through themes	A	B	C	D	F
18.	Real writing activities (e.g. journal writing, letters, responses to reading)	A	B	C	D	F
19.	Acceptance of invented spelling	A	B	C	D	F
20.	Use of open-ended activities	A	B	C	D	F
21.	Divergent questions and answers	A	B	C	D	F
22.	Students actively engaged in reading 'connected text'	A	B	C	D	F
23.	Interaction with print through a multitude of expressive forms	A	B	C	D	F
24.	Clear instances where writing precedes reading and is tied directly to learning experiences in reading.	A	B	C	D	F

References

Aiex, N. (1988). Literature based reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, 2, 458-461.

Allen, R.V. (1976). Language experiences in communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Anderson, D. and Simons, S. (1988). The seven secrets of success. Instructor, 15-19.

DeFord, D. (1978). A validation of an instrument to determine a teachers' theoretical orientation to reading instruction. (A Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts, 40, 4008A.

Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affects children's writing. Language Arts, 60, 607-616.

Ford, M.P. and Ohlhausen, M.M. (1988). Tips from reading clinicians for coping with disabled readers in regular classrooms. The Reading Teacher, 45, 18-22.

Froese, V. (1991). Whole language: practice and theory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodman, K.S. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Goodman, K.S. (1989). Whole language research: foundations and development. The Elementary School Journal, 90, (2), 207-221.

Harste, J. (1990). Jerry Harste speaks on reading and writing. The Reading Teacher, 316-318.

Hawthorne, D.H. (1991). Teachers' pupil control ideology and their theoretical orientation to reading. Unpublished specialist field problem. University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Ms.

Hayward, R.A. (1988). Inside the whole language class- room. Instructor. 34-40.

May, F. (1990). Reading as communication: an interactive approach. Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co.

Price, D.W. (1990). A model for reading and writing about primary sources: Teaching of Psychology, 17, (1), 48-53.

Scheffler, A.J. (1991). Affecting shifts in teachers' theoretical orientation to reading. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Ms.

Shanahan, T. (1984). Nature of the reading-writing relationship. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 466-477.

Smith, F. (1988). Understanding Reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Spivey, N.N. and King, J.R. (1989). Readers as writers composing from sources. Reading Research Quarterly, 24,(1),7-26.

Stewart, S. & Kentucky Department of Education (1987). Language: creating a literate environment for reading and writing development. Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders, 11, (1), 91-106.

Tierney, R.J., Sotor, A., O'Flahaven, J.F., & McGinley, W. (1989). The effects of reading and writing upon thinking critically. Reading Research Quarterly, 24, (2),134-169.